

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

			T	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/665,514	09/22/2003	Marius Hauri	0100/0165	5820
21395 LOUIS WOO	7590 09/29/2011		EXAM	IINER
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO			WITCZAK, CATHERINE	
ALEXANDR	FAYETTE STREET IA. VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	.,		3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/665,514	HAURI ET AL.				
Examiner-initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CATHERINE N. WITCZAK	3767				
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_				
(1) <u>CATHERINE N. WITCZAK</u> .	(3)					
(2) <u>Louis Woo</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: 26 September 2011	Time: <u>12:45</u>					
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:						
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:						
Claims discussed: 29-55						
Prior art documents discussed:						
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:				
Part III.						
□ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.						
/Catherine N Witezak/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)				

Application No. 10/665,514

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: New claims filied 9/13/11 are identical to the claims which were previously on appeal. The Examiner's rejection of the claims which were affirmed by the Board included a 103 rejection of claims under Crawford as modified by Hudon, wherein the Examiner used the Hudon reference as teaching that it would be obvious to modify the Crawford reference with a rotatably mounted collar as taught by Hudon. With the filling of the new claims, Applicant included a statemnt disqualifying the Hudon reference as prior art under 35 USC 103(c) because the application and the Hudon reference were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the assignee of the instant application. Upon updating her search, Examiner found another reference which also teaches a rotatibly mounted collar, and can be used instead of the the disqualified Hudon reference to modify the Crawford reference. Given that in the previous examination of the claims, certain claims were objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but otherwise allowable, Examiner called the Applicant to discuss possibly amending the claims with these limitations to put the claims in condition for allowance, rather that having a rejection sent out in which the Hudon reference is simply replaced with a reference teaching the same rotatibly mounted collar, but having a date which qualiffest it as a 103 (c) reference. Applicant onted to have the rejection sent out.